ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 7/14/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW
ED000341	7075	N.A.	

4. AUTHOR(S):

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
Reports on Current C.S.L.E.A. Projects, No. 1: Hunter College Experimental Course

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
N.A.

7. EDITOR(S):
N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. C.S.L.E.A.
ST. 4819 S. Greenwood St.
CITY, STATE Chicago, Illinois
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
Center for the Study of Liberal Edu. for Adults

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	59	27

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

integration S-18	core curriculum R-36	political science P-16			
graduate edu. S-04	history S-09	economics G-08			
curriculum R-53	philosophy P-11	art education R-15			

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

Descriptive report of "Freedom and Authority," an experimental interdisciplinary graduate course including problems in history, philosophy, political science, economics, sociology, and the creative arts. Course was designed to help students develop a conceptual framework for exploring the nature of freedom and its relation to authority.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OR PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

CLEARINGHOUSE
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS
4819 GREENWOOD AVENUE · CHICAGO 15 · ILLINOIS

IV-5

October 29, 1959

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

REPORTS ON CURRENT C.S.L.E.A. PROJECTS, NO. 1: HUNTER COLLEGE EXPERIMENTAL COURSE

Some experimental programs in which the Center participates never lead to major reports yet result in experience and insights which deserve to be made known to the field. We hope that a series of informal reports on these projects will prove useful and lead to further experiments in the areas involved.

The first of these reports, supplied by Ruth Weintraub and Rosalind Tough of Hunter College, describes an experimental interdisciplinary graduate course intended to help the student develop a conceptual framework for exploring the nature of freedom and its relation to authority. A particularly interesting aspect of this experiment was the use of a participant evaluator who observed the planning and execution of the program.

ED000341

MAR 29 1960

HUNTER COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

695 Park Avenue

New York 21,N.Y.

FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY IN THE WEST

Rosalind Tough
Hunter College
May, 1959

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
PREFACE	1
METHOD OF EVALUATION	2
COMPOSITION OF THE CLASS	3
THE PROFESSORIAL TEAM	3
THE STUDENT GROUP	3
DESIGN OF THE COURSE AND CLASSROOM PROCEDURES	5
GENERAL EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	6
A SUMMARY * THE SOCIAL VALUES	10
IN CONCLUSION	11
APPENDICES:	
APPENDIX A - THE STUDENT ASSESSMENT	12
ASSIGNMENTS	12
STRUCTURE OF THE COURSE	13
CLASS PROCEDURE	15
APPENDIX B - WILLIAM KIMMEL - COMMENTS	17
APPENDIX C - JOHN G. STOESSINGER - COMMENTS	19
APPENDIX D - SPECIMEN OUTLINE	21
APPENDIX E - THE FINAL EXAMINATION	23
APPENDIX F - THE FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE (USED FOR STUDENT SCREENING)	25
APPENDIX G - THE SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE (USED FOR STUDENT ASSESSMENT)	26

HUNTER COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY IN THE WEST

February 1958 - January 1959

PREFACE

Is freedom a goal toward which mankind universally strives? Is it a conceptual form which, as an ideal, can never be reached or, can freedom be approximated in varying degrees subject to the limitations of time, place and cultural situation? Are the individual's decisions and actions free because he interprets them to be so or, are there objective criteria that transcend the relativities of his interpretation?

For a period of one year, graduate students at Hunter College have been attempting to clarify these and other questions concerning freedom. It has been an exciting quest which has taken the student from Greece to modern Russia, from the Sophists to Sartre. It has involved an interdisciplinary approach including problems in history, philosophy, political science, economics, sociology and the creative arts. To explore the multiple claims for freedom and to clarify one's thinking about these claims was the primary objective of the course FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY.

The course FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY had as its secondary objective - the development progressively of a conceptual framework (or structure) into which the multiple dimensions of freedom could be related. To achieve this, the concepts of freedom and authority were examined from many points of view - historical, philosophical, psychological and social. In terms of time, historical and current sequenceswere compared. In this process, it was hoped that, through use of the dialectical method, students would receive training in analytical thinking.

It is doubtful that the course FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY could have come into existence without the help of THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION, Chicago, Illinois. This organization financed the course for a period of one year. Without this financial help, it would have been difficult to conduct the experiment, particularly in the second semester which was undertaken with a

relatively small seminar group of students. The Graduate Division in Arts and Sciences at Hunter College wishes to express appreciation for the generous assistance, and to thank Mr.JamesB.Whipple, Research Associate in the Center for his continued interest in the project.

METHOD OF EVALUATION:

It is generally conceded that the social dynamics of the classroom are not easy to measure. Social interaction between a professor and his students depends upon a multiplicity of variables and, at any one time, a number of these may be functioning simultaneously. How much weight should be given to any one of these variables, either alone or in combination, is impossible to determine. Thus any evaluation of student-professor relationships must be somewhat arbitrary.

Consultation between the evaluator and the two instructors giving the course on FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY resulted in an agreement on the following procedure:
(a) The evaluator was invited to be present at each session of the classes for the Fall and Spring semesters, January 1958-February 1959. (To the members of the class, some of whom the evaluator knew, the role undertaken was that of "auditor").
(b) Two questionnaires were given to the members of the classes. One of these, distributed at the beginning of the semester, was used to ascertain the qualificationsof students; it dealt with general information concerning the student and his objectives in taking the course. 1/ The second questionnaire, distributed at the end of the course, dealt with student reaction to assignments, class procedure, structure of the course, and a general estimate of the course. 2/

The answers, included in the two questionnaires, have been tallied for each semester and the results are presented. The appraisal of the second questionnaire is given in Appendix A under the heading STUDENT ASSESSMENT. Two appraisals of the course by the two instructors involved are included in the Appendices B and C. The Section of the report headed GENERAL EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION is the result of the evaluator's own observations and recommendations.

1/ See Appendix F
2/ See Appendix G

It is generally conceded that any evaluator is not without his own preconceptions and must, of necessity, make his judgments in terms of this "looking-glass." Perhaps it should be mentioned here that what this evaluator reflects is undoubtedly influenced by specialization in the field of sociology, with some knowledge of social philosophy. Therefor , whatever exists in the section EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS undoubtedly is the reflection of what might be termed "a social science point of view".

COMPOSITION OF THE CLASSES:

Social interaction is a two way process, involving both the professor and his students; the outcome of the classroom activities depends, to no small extent, on the characteristics of each.

THE PROFESSORIAL TEAM:

The two persons, responsible for the course FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY, have diverse backgrounds and approaches to the course. The senior member, a Full Professor in the Department of Music at Hunter College received a Ph.D. degree from the University of Rochester. Subsequently he studied philosophy in the graduate schools of Columbia and Yale Universities.

The junior member, holding a Ph.D. degree from Harvard University, is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science. His influence in this field has been extended from the classroom into a wider area, through television.

THE STUDENT GROUPS:[3/]

Experimentation with two student groups of different sizes was undertaken in the two semesters. In the first semester, a relatively large group, 28 students, was enrolled; in the second semester only 9 students, each carefully screened, were admitted. Two of the best students from the first semester were among the 9 students included in the second semester; thus 7 students in the

3/ Twenty-one of the 28 students enrolled in the first semester of the course FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY answered the questionnaire submitted at the beginning of the semester; of the 21 responding 6 were men and 15 were women.

All of the 9 students enrolled in the second semester answered the same questionnaire, again submitted at the beginning of the semester; of the 9 responding, 4 were men and 5 were women.

second semester were new to the course.

Diversity was characteristic of the students. In the first semester in age, they range from 21-43, although about two-thirds of them were less than 30. In the second semester, the range was from 23-31. Only about one-third of them graduated from Hunter; the majority came from the other city colleges and from other schools such as Bryn Mawr, Brandeis University, Long Island University, St.John's College in Brooklyn, University of Iowa, etc.

The undergraduate majors of these students were predominately history and the other social sciences. However, philosophy, psychology, music and engineering were also represented.

What many of the students had in common was that graudate work was a part-time occupation; it was undertaken for the most part, after a full day of employment, largely in teaching, although the fields of social welfare and business were included. In addition, during the first semester there was a nucleus of 6 full-time graduate students who were enrolled in the Louis Rabinowitz School of Social Work at Hunter College; during the second semester, there were 2 such students. For these students the course FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY was an optional course, toward an M.A. degree in the field of Social Work.

In general, students are attracted to experimental courses. The student response to the new course FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY was no exception. When asked at the beginning of the semester - what are your reasons for taking the course - also what do you expect to derive from the course - some of the answers could be classified under the headings "interest in the experiment".

For other students, a real need was expressed in the phrase " a desire for intellectual stimulation". Such a need was indicated by student, aged 26, who is teaching social studies in a high school and who as an undergraduate in Hunter College, acquired background primarily in philosophy and history. She stated: "I am not quite naive enough to expect solutions to the problems of FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY, nor am I charlatan enough to desire only a kind of intellectual gymnast-

ics, what I expect is somewhere in between - a certain intellectual exhiliration and some careful consideration of problems which are as troubling as they are insoluble. For quite some time I have thought of many of the topics listed in the syllabus; perhaps this course may help me to systematize my thinking."

DESIGN OF THE COURSE AND CLASSROOM PROCEDURES:

The course FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY, was designed for mature graduate students. Thus, before admission to the course, each semester the students were screened individually, by means of the questionnaire, hereinbefore mentioned, and a personal interview.

Actually there were three somewhat unusual features to the course. The first of these, a unique feature was the juxtaposition of a historical and contemporary situation; within each of these situations, a common problem of freedom was to be analyzed. During the course of the two semesters it was the objective to analyze each semester thirteen of such situations, grouped under two major headings.

The second feature of the course, also unique, was to attempt to build the conceptual structure of the course, piece by piece, reserving the general definitions of freedom for the conclusion of the course.
Thus a construct for an interpretation of freedom, in its many aspects, was to be erected, through the cooperative efforts of both faculty and students. In other words, the approach to this course was inductive rather than deductive so that the completed frame of reference was to be evolved at the end, rather than at the beginning of the course.

The third feature of the course, although not unique, nevertheless was responsible for the course design adopted. Given by two professors and supplemented by two guest speakers, the course was inter-disciplinary. 4/

4/ The guest speakers, both from Columbia University were: Professor L.C.Dunn, Department of Zoology and Professor Justus Buehler, Department of Philosophy.

Throughout both semesters, the classroom practice followed a general pattern. Each weekly session began with a lecture, approximately forty minutes, given by one of the two professors. The purpose of the lecture was to present a selected problem of freedom and to suggest various points of view for its interpretation. The second professor speaking approximately twenty minutes supplemented the initial presentation by introducing some alternative points of view. The objective was to include controversial aspects of the situations as a basis for later discussion between professors and students. These discussions extended through the rest of the classroom period, approximately forty minutes.

At the end of the semester the students were graded on the basis generally adopted for graduate courses, i.e. classroom performance, a semester paper and a final examination. However, since two professors were involved, each grades given was the result of a joint evaluation.

GENERAL EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

ONE:

The reaction of both the professors and the students to the course FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY was that the second semester was a very successful experiment and that the first semester was less effective. Although a number of variables were responsible for this, i.e. the types of materials covered in each semester, and the fact that the two professors had the first semester in which to gain experience, nevertheless, it was generally agreed that one variable predominated, i.e. the smaller size of the class composed of selected students, in the second semester.

RECOMMENDATION: This course in its present form should not be given for more than fifteen students. At the graduate level, a course, which is using primarily philosophical conceptual tools for analysis of data taken from both philosophy and the social sciences must be limited to students who have some knowledge of these tools. Furthermore such students in small numbers, have the opportunity to apply their knowledge

to the specific materials under discussion.

TWO:

There is some question as to whether or not the sights of the course are generally too high. The answer to this question, however, hinges largely on the screening process used in admitting students to the course. It seems to be evident that the average graduate student lacks the philosophical background to do adequate work in the course as it is now organized. For example, in the first semester, to attempt to cover two time sequences (historical and current) and to include freedom in relationship to six areas (authority of the state, religious authority, convention, scientific method, human will and creativity in the arts) is a "large order." Assuming, however that the course is not to be given to a selected group of students but rather to the average student the following recommendations would seem to be in order:

RECOMMENDATION: To meet the needs of the average graduate student, curtailment of materials included should be effected: It would be possible to select one or perhaps two of the problems each semester, i.e. for the first semester authority of the state alone or authority of the state and social convention; these materials could then be presented both for the historical and current periods.

THREE:

This evaluator feels that the materials presented in the course FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY were excellent. This fact was also recognized by a number of the best students in the course, to whom every session represented two hours of intellectual stimulation.

However, as has been indicated hereinbefore, there were a group of students in the first semester who did not concur, largely because they did not understand the material being presented. Actually in the first semester when asked the question: what portion of the material presented in the lectures were you able to

understand - only 6 of the 15 students responding believed that they understood four-fifths or more of the lecture material.

The superior background of the students in the second semester was evidenced by the fact that none of them understood less than 80 percent of the lecture material and the majority understood as much as 95 perc[illegible] of the data presented.

RECOMMENDATION: The materials presented each semester should have greater relevance to the experience of the student. This does not mean necessarily less of an analytical approach but rather one in which the materials presented can be tied in more closely with the students educational background and business or professional experience. For example, perhaps illustrative materials might be taken from the student's special fields of interest.

FOUR:

It will be recalled that one of the primary objectives of this course was to arrive at a construct of freedom, by the end of the course. It is true that, by the end of the first semester, such a construct was developed; however, from the point of view of some of the students, this was too late.

Because the two professors recognized this difficulty, they experimented with the use of a frame of reference for the second semester, presented both at the beginning and, in a revised form at the end of the semester.

RECOMMENDATION: A clear-cut construct of both freedom and authority should continue to be given both at the beginning and at the end of each semester. Greater use of the construct should be made in the analysis of data throughout each semester. Since the construct acceptable to the two professors differs somewhat, areas of similarity and difference should be emphasized, more clearly at the beginning of each semester.

FIVE:

Students in the second semester were enthusiastic about the faculty-student discussions; in contrast, students in the first semester expressed general lack of enthusiasm for the faculty-student discussions.

The evaluatior was surprised at the reaction of first semester students. (Actually, during the first semester, the whole class often remained as much as thirty minutes after the class period to continue the discussion). The difficulty, however, was the tendency of some students to air their own biases instead of presenting their comments in conceptual terms, within the framework of the course, Because of the incidence of the above, during the first semester, the tendency of this commentator would have been to agree with the student who said:"class discussion was sometimes poor and sometimes very fine".

In the second semester of the course, the two professors attempted to cope with the difficulties in faculty-student discussion. The result was a series of concepts couched largely in philosophical terms, introduced at the beginning of the semester to be used during the semester in analysis of data.

RECOMMENDATION: In addition to the emphasis on philosophical definitions, more concepts used in the social sciences should be included. Since the students have relatively more background in the social sciences than in philosophy a comparative analysis of selected concepts from both areas would be useful. It is quite evident that for students with inadequate backgrounds in philosophy and, in some instances, in the social sciences, such concepts cannot be assumed. Without such tools, the student is unable to analyze his own statements or to comprehend fully the point of view of the professor.

SIX:

The large group of students in the first semester and the small group in the second semester of the course FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY both appreciated the intellect-

ual stimulation of two different points of view, as presented by the two professors involved.

RECOMMENDATION: A year graduate course in FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY should continue to be given at Hunter College by a professorial team of two persons representing different points of view. The two approaches, that of philosophy and that of the social sciences, which were the two patterns adopted for the experimental year course, should be continued. They represent an inter-disciplinary approach which has an intellectual appeal to the better graduate students.

A SUMMARY - THE SOCIAL VALUES

A profile of a course should include an analysis of values, where they exist; a number of such were present in the course FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY IN THE WEST.

One such value was the fact that the course was a new experience for some of the students. For these students, the whole approach was different because either the students had been out of school for a few years or, the type of courses they had been taking included largely concrete rather than abstract materials. This was evidenced in the answers to the question - in comparison with other graduate courses which you have taken, in philosophy, history and social sciences, how would you grade this course? What one student said was indicative: "I feel that there is no comparison between the courses I have taken and this course; it was different in the originality of its structure and its method of presentation." Several of the other students had comparable comments.

A second value was the intellectual stimulation given by the course. It was the first time that some of the students had had the opportunity to participate in a course which was a "meaningful experience." The comment of one mature student was: "this is the first stimulating and exciting course that I have taken and the

most difficult." A student with a good philosophical background commented: "the sincerity, labor and stimulus have been undeniable; it has been a deep personal and emotional experience." Still a third student commented: "the lectures were excellently prepared and delivered." With each of these comments, the evaluator is in accord.

A third value was in terms of the enthusiasm on the part of some of the students. Sometimesthree or four students simultaneously wanted the floor at once and disagreed with each other vehemently. It was true that the discussion sometimes varied from the point of issue; it was true that the student's analysis of the problem was sometimes clouded by the fact that his concepts were not clear cut; it was true, also, that in the first semester only, not all students participated, primarily because of insecurity in the field of philosophy. Despite these limitations, however, there was a feeling of vitality in the classroom.

At the end of the second semester, student interest was so great that they requested the professors to continue to meet informally, so that discussion could continue. This evaluator feels that this student reaction may be considered to be of primary value of the course.

By the end of each semester, there was another value, which dealt with freedom itself. During the semester, successive analyses of freedom within various societies, both historical and current, brought to the attention of the student a significant aspect of freedom, i.e. that freedom is not a "commodity" but rather a "possibility". Freedom is not automatically provided and guaranteed by the State; rather, in order to exist, freedom is continually in the process of being achieved and defended. For those students who grasped this attribute of freedom, this was, perhaps, the most valuable contribution of the course.

IN CONCLUSION:

The course FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY is inter-disclipinary. Because of this fact, it has the characteristics existant to every course of this type - a student body with varied backgrounds, instructors who have diverse orientations, broad

subject matter which lends itself to varied interpretations and a multiplicity of available conceptual tools. Perhaps it can be said that such a course suffers from a plethora of riches.

As in other courses which are integrated, the problem in FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY was to choose what should be included in the course and to determine how these materials should be presented. Of necessity, the choice was somewhat arbitrary and experimental. This fact was recognized by the professors, the students and the evaluator. Thus this report has been undertaken with the belief that from its findings and the general experience gained during the school year, a modified course will evolve. Eventually, it is hoped that FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY, interdisciplinary in nature, analytical in method and comprehensive in scope will become an essential part of the permanent graduate offerings at Hunter College.

APPENDIX A

THE STUDENT ASSESSMENT[5/]:

Since each person assesses a course from his own point of view, it is to be expected that student assessments of any course will vary. Such was the case for the course FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY. There are, however, general areas in which students concur; it is these areas which are of particular significance in this analysis.

ASSIGNMENTS:

It was assumed that students would spend four to six hours in preparation for each session. In general, the students agreed that the assignments were too long. As a result during the first semester two-thirds of the 15 students

5/ Fifteen of the 28 students enrolled in the first semester of the course FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY answered this questionnaire, which was submitted at the end of the semester. Seven of the 9 students enrolled in the second semester of the course answered this questionnaire, again submitted at the end of the semester.

reporting stated that they did one-half or less of the required reading; only one student reported doing all the required reading. During the second semester students read relatively more; 5 of the 7 students reporting did three-quarters or more of the required reading.

In addition to the required reading, supplementary reading suggestions were included in the syllabus. During the first semester with two exceptions the students reported reading 10 percent or less of the supplementary readings. In contrast, during the second semester, the students read a substantial part, about one-fourth of the supplementary readings.

The students reported that they found the readings useful in the analysis of the problems included in the course. During the first semester, three-fifths of the students stated that they used the readings in their analyses; during the second semester all the students made such use of the readings.

In answer to the question - what changes (if any) would you recommend in assignments - the following suggestions were among those made by students in the first semester: limit the amount to be read - to save the students time, books should be made more accessible [6] - student committees might present selected assignments to the class and discussion might ensue. During the second semester, other than reduction of length of assignments, no suggestions were made.

STRUCTURE OF THE COURSE:

One feature of FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY was the fact that two professors, with different areas of specialization, were presenting the course. When asked to comment on the effectiveness of this procedure, the student reaction was generally favorable. During the first semester, 11 of the 15 students responding said that the effectiveness of the course was increased; the two professorial points of view were characterized as "stimulating". During the second semester, the respons was uniformly favorable to having two professors.

[6] In the near future, this problem will probably be solved through open-shelf collections of books in the Hunter College Library.

For both semesters student reaction to an organization of material involving a historical and a contemporary problem was uniformly favorable. However, in answer to the question - what is your reaction to the number of problems included- 7 of the 15 students responding during the first semester used the term "adequate". The other 8 students, however, stated that there were "too many" problems included. The reaction during the second semester was comparable; 3 of the 6 students answering the question thought there were "too many" problems. It was generally conceded that each problem deserved more time than could be given to it during the course.

Initially, at the end of each semester it was planned to give one two-hour examination. (This is a pattern that is generally followed for graduate courses in Hunter College). However, at the end of the first semester, it was necessary, to modify the original plan.

Toward the end of the first semester an insecurity regarding the course was evidenced among some of the students.
This took, the form of a group request to be excused from the final examination. To grant the request would have necessitated grading the student merely on his semester report, supplemented by his class participation. Because this was not considered to be sufficient and because of final examination had been scheduled, the request was not granted.

For the first semester, therefore, to make the students feel more secure, a diversified final examination was devised. This included: (1) a "take home examination" of one question, (2) a final examination, extending for two hours covering the assigned readings (20 short-answer questions) and two essay questions, largely on the lectures. 7/ This gave the student the opportunity to present what he knew both from the lectures and from his outside readings.

For purpose of experiment at the end of the second semester, instead of a two hour written examination each student was required to prepare a paper on his

7/ See Appendix D

concepts of FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY. These papers were read in class and commented on by other student members of the class and by the two professors. The results elicited so much interest that the students requested an additional session, which was granted. In this session, each professor summarized his concepts on FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY.

CLASS PROCEDURE:

As has been indicated, hereinbefore, the weekly class period of one hundred minutes included: a lecture by one of the two professors (approximately 40 minutes), comments from the second professor (approximately 20 minutes) and discussion between the professors and the students (approximately 40 minutes). During the first semester, two lectures were given by visiting professors; in each instance, the guest speaker was from Columbia University. During the second semester, there were no guest speakers. 8/

(a) Lectures

During the first semester, reactions of the students to lectures were both favorable and unfavorable. They unamiously approved the guest speakers. Two-thirds of the 15 responding liked the regular lectures and the inter-professorial discussion; the other one-third either disliked these or were ambivalent. During the second semester, the seven student's reporting on this question, all expressed themselves in favor of the lectures and inter-professorial discussion.

(b) Class Discussions

During the first semester students were somewhat unfavorable to class discussions; in contrast, in the second semester all the students reported liking class discussion. The facts that the class was small during the second semester, that the students were a selected group and that each student could participate in the discussion undoubtedly resulted in their favorable reaction.

In terms of improvement of class discussion, some of the suggestions were: "keep the comments pertient" -"have the class discussion more guided" -"prevent

8/ See Footnote Number 4

the students from using the discussion as a personal sounding-board" -"professors should demand cogency from the student discussions." It must be emphasized again that the above suggestions came from students in the first semester of the course.

During the first semester, both dislike and ambivalence were generally associated with lack of understanding, on the part of the student, of the philosophical materials included. Such students reported a poor background in philosophy; as a result they stated that they understood less than half of the materials included in the lectures and the inter-professorial discussion. In contrast, during the second semester, all students reported understanding 80-95 per cent of the lecture material.

Suggestions for improvement of lectures and inter-professorial discussion, made by the students who lacked philosophical background, were as follows: the focus of the course should be changed; the material should be related to everyday matters. Needless to say, these students were oriented towards concrete rather than analytical thinking. Another comment somewhat comparable was -" the course should be more closely related to life experience."

It should be emphasized that the above suggestions came only from students in the first semester. In the second semester the following comments were typical "this is a wonderful training in approaches possible to the subject matter - it allows the mind to widen its frame of references." From another student -" I felt that in any particular lecture, the comments of the non-lecturing professors were very stimulating."

APPENDIX B

WILLIAM KIMMEL - COMMENTS: FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY IN THE WEST - First Semester, Jan.-June 1958

(STATEMENTS IN PARENTHESES ARE EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS, May 1959)

1. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS:

A. In its present form, the course demands more on the part of the students than some of the Hunter College graduate students are capable of giving. It presupposes a broader and more comprehensive liberal arts background than many of the students have, especially in the fields of the history of ideas and philosophy, and in abstract thinking in general. It demands from four to six hours of preparation for each session.

B. For significant and effective discussion, a class of 28 students is too large; a maximum of 16 students should be maintained, seated; if possible around tables in a seminar room. (In the second semester, the course was taught as a seminar).

C. At the beginning of a semester, more time should be devoted to the following: developing a conceptual framework as a basis for subsequent discussions; establishing definitions for fundamental and recurring terms; clarifying the problems which inevitably present themselves in an inter-disciplinary course; and making clear what is and is not discussion, i.e. to establish rules of procedure for genuine discussion. (In the second semester the introductory session of the course was used to present a tentative conceptual framework and to establish definitions of fundamental terms. In the final session of the second semester, the conceptual framework, somewhat revised, was again emphasized but, at this time, for purposes of summary.)

II. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. ON THE SYLLABUS:

1. The topics listed in the syllabus are large and broad; the problem of freedom in each topic might be more clearly focused and stated at the beginning of each session.

2. Since the students have a limited time to read, the assignments should be further reduced and more specifically defined.

B. ON PROCEDURE:

1. For each topic (i.e. each exposition and discussion) the concepts, in which the problem is stated, must be more clearly defined. There are few terms in the fields of philosophy and social science in which there is agreement on definition and consequently similarity of use. Thus definitions of concepts must be accepted by the seminar and used consistenly throughout the term. (Again in the second term, greater emphasis was placed upon clarification of terms.)

2. Some of the introductory expositions should be further abridged and concentrated. There is a tendency to fall into the lure of the historical "subject matter" and to lose the clear focus of the problem.

3. Controversial dialogue should take place between the two instructors only where a specific point of view is taken by one, thus making possible a rather clear counter point of view. Both professors, however, tend to be dialectical in their expositions, presenting alternative points of view and developing both sides of a problem. This stands in the way of genuine opposition of point of view or requires the introduction of a third alternative, thus defeating or unduly complicating the problem. The introduction of a new conceptual framework in a counter exposition confuses the problem and makes it difficult to develop a consistent and unified discuss-

ion in a single session. (In the second semester, the recommendation above concerning controversial dialogue was generally effected.)

C. ON DISCUSSION:

1. A clear formulation of the nature of discussion, the limits of discussion and the rules of discussion should be established at the outset and rigorously enforced throughout the session.
2. Discussion for a given session should be led by only one of the instructors.
3. Group discussion should be carried on between members of the class. Better seating arrangement in a seminar encourages this.
4. Discussion should be in two parts; a ten minute period devoted to clarification of exposition, its definitions and concepts; the rest to exploring the implications of the problem and reconciling differences in point of view.
5. More attention should be devoted by the instructors to assisting the students in the manipulation of concepts and to the avoidance of mere expression of attitudes, preference and opinion.(During the second semester, the above objectives on discussion, for the most part, were realized.)

APPENDIX C

JOHN C. STOESSINGER - COMMENTS ON THE CONDUCT OF FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY IN THE WEST - First Semester - Jan.-June 1958.

(STATEMENT IN PARENTHESIS IS EVALUATOR'S COMMENT, May 1959)

My major concern with the course was the nature of the discussion following the exposition and comment. As a general rule, it tended to lack discipline and rigor and at times was not clearly related to what preceded. Several improvements might be in order:

1. A greater attempt might be made by Professor Kimmel and me to discuss each subject as much as possible within the same conceptual framework.

Perhaps even different positions might be taken within the same frame of reference to accentuate the dialectical relationship of the instructors. However, I am not entirely convinced about the merit of this technique since it is pedagogically not beyond criticism. Also, analyses by the two instructors rather than "positions" enable the student to arrive at his own "analysis of the analysis", which would be one step beyond an "analysis of a position". Nevertheless, I would recommend the "position approach" for the first few sessions of FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY, in order to focus on a clear-cut issue and give direction and rigor to the discussion which is to follow.

2. The size of the class should be reduced to about fifteen carefully selected members to produce the optimum quality of discussion.

3. I would not recommend a cutting of topics for the second half of the course. Fifteen weeks seems ample for the 12 topics to be covered.

4. I would recommend continuance of the inductive method of developing definitions of freedom. An initial attempt to find definitions in vacuo would, I feel, not be related by students to the areas of their experience. On the other hand, certain working definitions shouldbe established as tools toward a common frame of reference. (As was indicated in the evaluator's comments, Appendix B, during the second semester the two professors experimented with the suggested changes. The results were evidenced, in unanimous student approval).

APPENDIX D

SPECIMEN OUTLINE - FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY IN THE WEST

SOCRATES AND THE POLIS
CENSORSHIP IN THE USSR

Two composite case studies were presented, one classic, the other modern, of the timeless problem of civic freedom.

The Socratic case attempted to explore the elements of contradiction in the demands of individual freedom and those of stability. Was this man, who described himself as a pious and loyal citizen, dangerous to the general welfare during his time? Had be been allowed too much liberty? Were the Athenians right to silence him?

The above areas were explored with the help of a selection of readings which gave equal weight to the case of the prosecution, that of the defense, and an objective appraisal of both. The purpose was not to exhaust the material, but to outline the problem areas in order to reveal their depth, seriousness, and ambiguities.

The case for the prosectuion included the following topics: A.E.Taylor's indictment that Socrates taught ideals incompatible with Athenian citizenship, Aristophanes' critique by ridicule in The Clouds, Eduard Zeller's thesis of arrogance and a sense of superiority to the democratic process, and finally Nietzsche's attack based upon the assumption of intellectual decadence.

The case for the defense dealt with Plato's Apology, with the interpretation that expediency dictated a judgment demanded by the majority's unwillingness to submit its way of life to rational scrutiny. Karl Popper's thesis that Socrates was loyal in the deepest sense to democratic ideals was examined. Toynbee's claim that Socrates' mission had characteristics of a secular messianic nature, was considered. The final selection was John Stuart Mill's On Liberty which regards the execution of Socrates as an act performed in ignorance by men who knew not what they did.

The problems explored in the case study on the USSR were essentially a modern counterpart of the Socratic problem. How far may a government go in

APPENDIX D (Continued)

censoring the institutions of society without imperiling its existence? What are the psychological limits of thought control? How does the totalitarian state compensate the individual for the absense of free expression? Are we dealing with a new form of "totalitarianism with the consent of the governed?"

A. Inkeles' Public Opinion in Soviet Russia presents the strengths of a rigid censorship system as well as a justification of this technique in terms of the regime's survival. The book also explores the stresses and strains of the thought control system in its application to the individual. Finally, an objective appraisal of both strengths and weaknesses of the Soviet censorship system was attempted.

The method of presentation of the topics included exposition of the material by the lecturer, dialectical exchange between them to reveal the depth of the problems further, and finally a Socratic discussion involving the class.

APPENDIX E

HUNTER COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

45.605 - Final Examination

FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY IN THE WEST

Part I - (30 minutes)

Answer the following 25 questions:

1) In what work does Nietzache work out his conception of Dionysian and Apollonian dimensions of consciousness?

2) In what work does Plato defend Socrates against the accusations of the Athenian polis?

3) Name one work that traces the history of the problems of the church-state relationship in America.

4) In what work does Machiavelli present his theory of dictatorial rulership?

5) With whom do you associate The Edict of Milan?

6) With Machiavelli, are human emotions A)evil; B) Good; C) mixed

7) Does Martin Buber consider the I - It relationship between individuals to be an unnecessary relationship?

8) With whom do you associate philosophical intuition?

9) Name a recent "case" in which freedom of expression was upheld by the courts in opposition to church censorship.

10) Who first cited the phrase "Wall of separation between church and state?"

11) Identify Andrei Zhdanov.

12) Who pronounced the doctrine of the two swords as the official doctrine of the church?

13) Who is the author of the Defensor Pacis?

14) In which work does Freud attack theology?

15) Identify Lysenko

16) Name Schopenhauer's main philosophic work.

17) Who is the originator of the philosophy of "Loyalty to Loyalty?"

18) Nietzache attacks the Jews, but not Christianity in his attack upon religion.
True _____ False _____

19) What, in Lenin's definition, is the "transmission belt between the Party and the Masses?"

Appendix E-continued

20) Who is the author of "Perpectual Peace?"

21) Freud believed that technological advance would increase the causes of war.
True _____ False _____

22) Who is the author of The City of God?

23) Socrates was convicted by the Athenian jury
a) Unamimously
b) By a narrow majority
c) By an overwhelming majority

24) Who is the author of Creative Evolution?

25) Name four war criminals tried at Nuremberg.

Part II - (90 minutes)

Discuss critically the validity of any two of the following four quotations?

1) "The Nuremberg war crime trial grappled essentially with the same problem of freedom confronting Socrates and the Sophists." (Discuss)

2) "While the Freudian concept of freedom exaggerates the role of reason, Nietzsche's errs in the opposite direction." (Discuss)

3) "In the international politics of our nuclear age, Machiavelli's concept of political freedom is the only applicable one." (Discuss)

4) "The problem of freedom inherent in church-state relations in the United States has its genesis in the development of medieval Christianity." (Discuss)

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

TAKE-HOME EXAMINATION

"Science deals with measurement. Freedom is a value concept. Hence, the scientific method cannot be applied to problems of freedom and authority."

Discuss critically.

APPENDIX F - FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE

HUNTER COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY IN THE WEST

I. Name Age
Address
Telephone No.

II. Experience:

A. Degrees:_____ Institutions:_____Date_____

_____ _____ _____

B. Undergraduate major:_____

Graduate major:_____

C. Present status:
1. Matriculated:_____for what degree:_____with what major

2. Non-matriculated:_____

D. Courses taken previously: indicate number of courses taken.

1. Undergraduate

a. History_____
b. Political Science_____
c. Sociology_____
d. Economics_____
e. Philosophy_____

2. Graduate:

a. History_____
b. Politcal Science_____
c. Sociology_____
d. Economics_____
e. Philosophy_____

III. Present occupation:

IV. What were your reasons for electing the present course in Freedom?

V. What do you expect to derive from the course?

APPENDIXG -SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE

HUNTER COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY IN THE WEST

Please fill in the appropriate spaces and explain your answers when requested to do so.

A. ASSIGNMENTS

1. What is your estimate of the length of the weekly reading assignments -
   Too long_____ Too short_____ Adequate_____
2. Did you use the reading assignments to assist you in the analysis of the problems included in the course?
   Yes_____ No. (Explain)_____
3. What proportion of the required reading did you actually read?
   _____percent
4. What proportion of the additional reading did you complete?
   _____percent.
5. With respect to assignments, what changes (if any) would you recommend? (Explain)
   in type _____ in content_____
   in quality_____ other_____

B. CLASS PROCEDURE

6. What was your reaction to each of the following:

	Like	Dislike	No Opinion	Comment
a. Lectures	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Inter-professorial discussion	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Class discussions	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Visiting Specialists	_____	_____	_____	_____

7. What changes, if any, would you recommend in class procedures? (Please explain)_____

C. STRUCTURE OF THE COURSE

8. Was the juxtaposition of a historical and a contemporary problem an effective device?
   Yes_____ No (explain)_____
9. What is your reaction to the number of problems included
   Too many_____ Too few_____ Adequate_____
10. Which problems (if any) merited: More time_____
    Less time_____
11. Is the effectiveness of this course, conducted by two persons rather than one (explain)
    Increased_____ Decreased_____ The same _____

APPENDIX G (Continued)

D. YOUR EVALUATION OF THE COURSE

12. Has this course influenced your thinking?
In general Yes_____ No (explain)_____
On freedom Yes_____ No (explain)_____

13. Do you discuss the problems raised in the course outside the classroom?
Yes_____ No (explain)_____

14. Which (if any) of the books listed would you choose to have in your own library?
Book Title (explain choice)
_____
_____
_____

15. When time permits, will you do additional reading in the literature listed
Yes _____ No (explain)_____

16. Houw would you evaluate your prior educational background in terms of adequacy for the course?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
History	_____	_____	_____	_____
Philosophy	_____	_____	_____	_____
Social Science	_____	_____	_____	_____

17. What proportion of the material presented in the lectures were you able to understand? _____ percent Please explain.

18. Would you recommend this course?
Yes_____ No (explain)_____

19. Are you planning to take the second semester of the course?
Yes_____ No (explain)_____

20. In comparison with other graduate courses which you have taken , in Philosophy, History, and Social Sciences, how would you grade this course?
Excellent _____ Fair _____
Good _____ Poor _____
(please explain)
_____
_____

E. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS YOU MAY CARE TO MAKE

_____
_____
_____